

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/003,837	PECK ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Tiffany A Fetzner	2859

**All Participants:**

(1) Tiffany A Fetzner. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Peter D. McDermott Reg. No. 29,411. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

**Date of Interview:** 1 June 2004

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

Telephonic  
 Video Conference  
 Personal (Copy given to:  Applicant     Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:**  Yes     No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*None*

**Claims discussed:**

38, 39

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*Raftery et al., US patent 6,696,838 B2; and Raftery et al., corresponding US patent application publication 2002/0130661 A1 published September 19<sup>th</sup> 2002.*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's attorney because applicant's supplemental May 24th 2004 after-final amendment response inadvertently did not list the status of pending claims 56-59. In the Remarks of the May 24th 2004 after-final claims 56-59 were referred to as canceled. The attorney gave the examiner permission to cancel claims 56-59 by examiner's amendment to correct the oversite, gave the examiner permission to charge any necessary fees, and asked the examiner to enter the changes to the original specification that were originally presented in the first after-final amendment of March 26th 2004, by examiner's Amendment as well, since the March 26th 2004 after-final amendment failed to place the application in condition for allowance, and was marked DO NOT ENTER by the examiner. The examiner agreed to enter the specification changes because the changes corrected outstanding formal matters, and did not constitute new matter. The examiner also noted the declaration under 37 CFR 1.116 submitted by Timothy Peck. March 26th 2004, concerning the changes to the specification. The examiner was thanked for her time. The authorization for the examiner's amendment, and the charging of appropriate fees is attached to this interview summary. .